



4 (2)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT

BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 610/ OF 2007

PETITIONER :

Ramlal Yadav Son of Shiv Prasad
Yadav, aged about 60 years,
Resident of Village Loharpathra,
Post Korra, Tahsil Kurud, District
Dhamtari (C.G.). ✓

RECEIVED-COPY
11/10/07
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through:
The Secretary, Water Resources
Department, D.K.S. Bhawan,
Raipur (C.G.). ✓
2. The Sub Divisional Officer,
Mahanadi Shirsha Jal Prabandh,
Sub Division No.1 Rudri, District
Dhamtari (C.G.). ✓

69781/07
P.R. No. 10191/07
Presented by Shri. U.P.S. Sanyal
dated 11/10/07

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF INDIA



01/11/07

30

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

W.P. (S) No.6101/2007

PETITIONER

Ramlal Yadav, Son of Shiv Prasad Yadav, aged about 60 years, Resident of Village Loharpathra, Post Karra, Tahsil Kurud, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Water Resources Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Sub Divisional Officer, Mahanadi Shirsha Jal Prabandh, Sub Division No.1 Rudri, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

Appearance:

Shri P.P. Sahu, Counsel for the petitioner.

Shri N.K. Agrawal, Senior Advocate and Deputy Advocate General with Shri A.S. Kachhwaha, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents.

ORAL ORDER

(31.10.2007)

SUNIL KUMAR SINHA, J.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a permanent Gang-man is to be retired at the age of 62 years in accordance with the *Chhattisgarh Shaskiya Sevak (Adhivarshiki-Ayu) Adhiniyam 1967* read with Fundamental Rules, 56. He also submits that the point raised has been decided by this Court in batch of matters i.e. W.P. No.108/2005 and many other connected matters on 04.01.2007, reported in **2007 (2) C.G.L.J. 29 (Govind & Others vs. State of C.G. and others)** and this matter is squarely covered by that decision, which may be disposed of on the same terms.

Learned counsel for the State fairly agrees that this matter is covered by the said decision. However, he submits that in some matters the State has filed writ appeals.



Unless some interim order is passed, merely on account of filing of the writ appeal, hearing of this writ petition cannot be kept in abeyance, when the matter is squarely covered by the said judgment.

In the result, this petition is allowed.

It is disposed of in terms of the order dated 04.01.2007 passed in W.P. No.108/2005 and other connected matters. No order as to cost.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge

Rao/
Shyna